



Patent and Trademark Office

•	COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
	Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. ICUMM.6FCFC6 G LOPEZ 09/28/99 09/407,147 **EXAMINER** QM12/0630

020995 KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP 620 NEWPORT CENTER DRIVE SIXTEENTH FLOOR NEWPORT BEACH CA 92660

YASKO JR,J **ART UNIT** PAPER NUMBER 3763

DATE MAILED:

06/30/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

		and the second s
	Application No. 09/407/47	Applicant(s) LOPEZ = tzl
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Group Art Unit 3763
The MAILING DATE of this communication appea	rs on the cover sheet b	eneath the correspondence address-
Period for Reply		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET T OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	O EXPIRE 30 DAY	MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE
 Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a relif NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state 	eply within the statutory minim , expire SIX (6) MONTHS fron	num of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. In the mailing date of this communication .
Status		
☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on		
☐ This action is FINAL.		
 Since this application is in condition for allowance except accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 193 		
Disposition of Claims	·	
Claim(s)		is/are pending in the application.
Of the above claim(s)		is/are withdrawn from consideration.
□ Claim(s)		is/are allowed.
☐ Claim(s)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	is/are rejected.
☐ Claim(s)		is/are objected to.
☐ Claim(s)————————————————————————————————————		are subject to restriction or election
Application Papers	•	requirement.
 See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawin 	a Roviow PTO-948	
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	•	□ disapproved
☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are object		a disapprovod.
☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.		
☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)		
☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority up	nder 35 U.S.C. § 11 9(a)-	(d).
☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of	- , ,	• •
□ received.		
 □ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number □ received in this national stage application from the Interest 		
*Certified copies not received:		
Attachment(s)		•
• •		
☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper N	lo(s) 🗆 Ir	nterview Summary, PTO-413

U. S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-326 (Rev. 9-97)

☐ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

Office Action Summary

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

☐ Other_____

Art Unit: 3763

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: Figures 3, 4; Figure 5, 6; Figures 7-22; Figures 23, 24; respectively.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, no claims are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Art Unit: 3763

The status of the related applications are required to be updated. Also, numerous handwritten mendments have been attempted at pages 9, 14, 15 and th specification. Clarification and/or correction is requested.

John Yasko:bhw3 June 13, 2000

JOHN D. YASKO PRIMARY EXAMINER

ART UNIT 236 376